



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

08/958864

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/958864	10/26/97	Pfizer Inc	MV

Pfizer Inc  
PATENT DEPARTMENT  
225 EAST 42ND STREET  
NEW YORK NY 10017-5755

10/26/97

EXAMINER

SMITHSON

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

102

DATE MAILED: 03/25/98

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_  
 This action is FINAL.  
 Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- Claim(s) 57--68 is/are pending in the application.  
Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 Claim(s) 57--68 is/are rejected.  
 Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.  
 The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.  
 The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.  
 The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).  
 All  Some\*  None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) 07/934,667.  
 received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

- Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892  
 Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
 Interview Summary, PTO-413  
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948  
 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Art Unit: 1611

Claims 57-68 are pending.

The instant application has specification typed on both sides of each page.

Applicant is requested to supply substitute specification, typed on one side of each page Patent Rule 1.526. It is not enclosed as applicants stated in REMARKS of their communication dated 01/16/97.

This application has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is, therefore, respected in promptly correcting any errors of which they may become aware in the specification. Examples of such errors are 1. On page 3 of amended claim 57, third line from bottom, the letter "l" is missing from 'heterocyclayamino' 2. On page 4 of amended claim 57, line 3 'group' is spelled wrong.

Claims 57-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S.P. 3,975,383.

The claims with  $A_1, A_2, A_3=\text{aryl}$ ;  $X=O/S$   $m=2$ ;  $n=o$ ;  $(c)=S-\overset{\overset{CH_2}{\diagdown}}{\underset{\overset{CH_2}{\diagup}}{}}-$  are embraced by the generic disclosure of prior art, see column 21, formula VIII A. Also see on columns 37 and 38 formula xx for a species disclosure.

Art Unit: 1611

A generic disclosure of the prior art directed to a recognizable small class of compounds having common properties which embrace the claimed compounds, in anticipatory notwithstanding the fact the claimed compounds are not specifically named. In re Schaumann et al. (C.C.P.A. 1978) 575 F2d 312, 197 U.S.P.Q. 5; In re Petering et al. (C.C.P.A. 1962) 301 F2d 676, 133 U.S.P.Q. 272; Ex parte Broadbent et al. (POBA 1965) 150 U.S.P.Q. 468.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is

Art Unit: 1611

advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 57-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nayler et al. U.S.P. 3,975,383 or Martel et al. U.S.P. 3,962,223.

The prior arts individually teach a generic group of cepheims, where R=cyclohexyl, phenyl, tetrahydropyranyl, etc., in formula VIII A and X being acylamino groups; See column 21, lines 46-60 of U.S. '383. Also see column 1, lines 65-68 and column 2, lines 1-3. The claims differ from the references by reciting a more limited genus than the reference. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select any of the species of the genus as taught by the reference, including those of the claims, because an ordinary artisan would have been the reasonable expectation that any of the species of the genus would have similar properties and, thus, the same use as the genus as whole.

Art Unit: 1611

The instantly claimed compounds would have been obvious to one skilled in the art because the indiscriminate selection of "some" from among "many" is considered prima facie obvious. In re Lemin, 141 U.S.P.Q. 814, National Distillers and chem. Corp. V. Brenner 156 U.S.P.Q. 163.

The Abstract and Title should incorporate the instant substituents.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner P.K. Sripada at telephone number (703) 308-4717.

SRIPADA; aco PK

Mukund J. Shah  
SRI PADA  
SUPERVISORY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1600

March 20, 1998